

BEFORE THE  
POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20268-0001

ANNUAL COMPLIANCE REVIEW, 2019

Docket No. ACR2019

RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE TO  
QUESTIONS 1-22 OF CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 3

The United States Postal Service hereby provides its responses to the above-listed questions of Chairman's Information Request No. 3, issued on January 13, 2020. Each question is stated verbatim and followed by the response.

Respectfully submitted,

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

By its attorneys:

Nabeel R. Cheema.  
Chief Counsel, Pricing & Product Support

Eric P. Koetting

475 L'Enfant Plaza, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20260-1137  
(202) 277-6333  
eric.p.koetting@usps.gov  
January 21, 2020

**RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE  
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 3**

1. Please refer to Library Reference USPS-FY19-4, December 27, 2019, Excel file "FY19 Special Services PRC.xlsx" (Billing Determinants), Library Reference USPS-FY19-42, December 27, 2019, Excel file "EOY\_FY2019\_RPWsummaryreport\_public.xlsx" (RPW), and the following table:

<b>Special Services Product</b>	<b>RPW Volume</b>	<b>Billing Determinant Volume</b>	<b>Difference (RPW minus Billing Determinants)</b>
Delivery Confirmation/USPS Tracking	5,422,411	2,265,587	3,156,824
Insurance	14,347,935	14,347,879 <sup>1</sup>	56
Post Office Box Service	5,637,930	5,666,078	(28,148)

- a. The table above reflects multiple discrepancies between the Revenue, Pieces and Weight (RPW) volumes and the billing determinant volumes in the volume totals for the following Special Services products: Delivery Confirmation/USPS Tracking, Insurance, and Post Office Box Service. Please reconcile these discrepancies.
- b. Please resubmit the annual Special Services Billing Determinants linked to the quarterly files. Please include the four individual quarterly Billing Determinants files and one aggregate file in your submission.

**RESPONSE:**

- a. Please see the discussions below.

Delivery Confirmation/USPS Tracking: The billing determinants report only the volume for which a fee is paid (the volume used with USPS Marketing Mail parcels). The RPW reports this volume as well as all of the volume that gets USPS Tracking included in postage for the host piece. Additionally, the table above incorrectly identifies the RPW volume of Delivery Confirmation/USPS Tracking by a factor of one thousand. The correct volume as reported in the RPW is 5,422,411,573; the difference between the volume reported in the

---

<sup>1</sup> This number can be calculated by taking the total of Insurance from Excel file "FY19 Special Services PRC.xlsx," tab "F-3 Insurance," cell G64, and subtracting the total for Restricted Delivery in cell G60 from it.

**RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE  
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 3**

Special Services Billing Determinants and the volume reported in the RPW is 5,420,144,986, which is the volume of USPS Tracking for the products, such as Priority Mail, for which there is no tracking fee. Please note that the plan for RPW is to report only the fee-paid volume for USPS Tracking, starting on January 26, 2020, consistent with the Mail Classification Schedule and the billing determinants.

Insurance: The RPW includes 56 units of Priority Mail Customer Package Intercept Signature Confirmation, which are not actually insurance pieces. The result is the overstatement of insurance volume by 56 units. The Postal Service has removed this category from RPW reporting for insurance as of Q1 FY20.

Post Office Box Service: The discrepancy has to do with the difference in the way the number of Post Office Boxes is reported in the Billing Determinants and in the RPW. In the RPW the number of Post Office Boxes is based on the number of paid boxes at the end of the Fiscal Year. For the Billing Determinants the number of Post Office Boxes reported is the average of the number of boxes for the four quarters.

b. The annual and quarterly Billing Determinants are developed in the same file. Starting in FY 2018, the format for the ACR Special Services Billing Determinants includes cell for each of the four individual quarters, using the numbers filed in the Periodic Reports, as adjusted during the preparation of the annual RPW

**RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE  
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 3**

report. The four quarterly cells are then summed to derive the annual billing determinants. Because of the annual RPW reconciliation process, the quarterly Billing Determinants cells provided in each tab of folder 4 are actually the source documents. This follows the approach used in Docket No. R2020-1, in which just one file was provided for the first three quarters of FY 2019. It also matches the approach used in this ACR docket for First-Class Mail and Periodicals.

**RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE  
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 3**

2. Please provide the national level percentages of First-Class Mail Single-Piece Letters/Postcards that were transported using air transit and ground transit. These results should be for Fiscal Quarters 1, 2, 3, 4, "mid-year,"<sup>2</sup> "second-half,"<sup>3</sup> and annually<sup>4</sup> for FY 2019. Please present results for each service standard (2-Day versus 3-5-Day) separately.

**RESPONSE:**

Geography	Fiscal Year	Service Standard	Transportation Mode	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4	Mid-Year	Second-Half	Annual
Nation	2019	Two-Day	Air	0.60%	0.67%	0.68%	0.70%	0.63%	0.69%	0.66%
Nation	2019	Two-Day	Surface	99.40%	99.33%	99.32%	99.30%	99.37%	99.31%	99.34%
Nation	2019	Three-to-Five-Day	Air	34.61%	34.84%	34.54%	35.02%	34.71%	34.77%	34.74%
Nation	2019	Three-to-Five-Day	Surface	65.39%	65.16%	65.46%	64.98%	65.29%	65.23%	65.26%

---

<sup>2</sup> Mid-year refers to the aggregation of the data for Quarters 1 and 2 of the applicable fiscal year.

<sup>3</sup> Second-half refers to the aggregation of the data for Quarters 3 and 4 of the applicable fiscal year.

<sup>4</sup> Annually refers to the aggregation of the data for all four fiscal quarters of the applicable fiscal year.

**RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE  
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 3**

3. Please refer to Library Reference USPS-FY19-29, December 27, 2019, Excel file "FY19 ACR FCM Q1-2-4-5 EOY.xlsx," tab "Q1\_PFCM."
- a. Please confirm that these data refer to the amount (number of percentage points) by which on-time performance decreased due to each specific root cause of failure.
  - b. If part a. of this question is not confirmed, please explain.
  - c. Please provide definitions and the hierarchy for assignment and assessment for the full set of root causes for First-Class Mail Presorted Letters/Postcards and presorted First-Class Mail Flats, including each type of "Root Cause" appearing in tab "Q1\_PFCM," column B. In the response, please indicate if each root cause applies to letter-shaped and/or flat-shaped mail.
  - d. Please explain how these data were calculated.
  - e. Please confirm that a root cause failure indicator is not assigned to a mailpiece that is delivered within its applicable service standard. If not confirmed, please explain.
  - f. Please confirm that no more than one root cause failure indicator is assigned per mailpiece. If not confirmed, please explain.

**RESPONSE:**

- a. Confirmed.
- b. Not applicable.
- c. Root cause definitions and the hierarchy for assignment and assessment are included in the file "ChIR.3.RootCauseDefintnsHierarchy.xlsx" that is electronically attached to these responses.
- d. These data were calculated by taking total failed volume attributed to each root casus divided by total failed volume attributed to all root causes multiplied by failure rate (((Failed Volume Attributed to Each Root Cause / Total Failed Volume Attributed to All Root Causes) \* (Total Failed Volume / Total Volume)) \* 100).

**RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE  
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 3**

- e. Confirmed.
- f. Confirmed.

**RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE  
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 3**

4. Please refer to Library Reference USPS-FY19-29, Excel file "FY19 ACR FCM Q1-2-4-5 EOY.xlsx," tab "Q1\_SPFC."
- a. Please confirm that these data refer to the amount (number of percentage points) by which on-time performance decreased due to each specific root cause of failure.
  - b. If part a. of this question is not confirmed, please explain.
  - c. Please provide definitions and the hierarchy for assignment and assessment for the full set of root causes for First-Class Mail Single-Piece Letters/Postcards and single-piece First-Class Mail Flats, including each type of "Root Cause" appearing in tab "Q1\_SPFC," column B. In the response, please indicate if each root cause identified applies to letter-shaped and/or flat-shaped mail.
  - d. Please explain how these data were calculated.
  - e. Please confirm that a root cause failure indicator is not assigned to a mailpiece that is delivered within its applicable service standard. If not confirmed, please explain.
  - f. Please confirm that no more than one root cause failure indicator is assigned per mailpiece. If not confirmed, please explain.

**RESPONSE:**

- a. Confirmed.
- b. Not applicable.
- c. Root cause definitions and the hierarchy for assignment and assessment are included in the file "ChIR.3.RootCauseDefintnsHierarchy.xlsx" that is electronically attached to these responses.
- d. These data were calculated by taking total failed volume attributed to each root casus divided by total failed volume attributed to all root causes multiplied by failure rate (((Failed Volume Attributed to Each Root Cause / Total Failed Volume Attributed to All Root Causes) \* (Total Failed Volume / Total Volume)) \* 100).



**RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE  
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 3**

- e. Confirmed.
- f. Confirmed.

**RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE  
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 3**

5. Please refer to the data provided by the Postal Service in response to item 2, subparts a through g, of the directive appearing in Docket No. ACR2018, Annual Compliance Determination, April 12, 2019, at 172 (FY 2018 ACD).<sup>5</sup>
- a. Please confirm that these data refer to the amount (number of percentage points) by which on-time performance decreased due to each specific root cause of failure.
  - b. If part a. of this question is not confirmed, please explain.
  - c. Please explain how these data were calculated.
  - d. Please confirm that a root cause failure indicator is not assigned to a mailpiece that is delivered within its applicable service standard. If not confirmed, please explain.
  - e. Please confirm that no more than one root cause failure indicator is assigned per mailpiece. If not confirmed, please explain.

**RESPONSE:**

- a. Confirmed.
- b. Not applicable.
- c. These data were calculated by taking total failed volume attributed to each root casus divided by total volume ((Failed Volume Attributed to Each Root Cause / Total Volume) \* 100).
- d. Confirmed.
- e. Confirmed.

---

<sup>5</sup> Library Reference USPS-FY19-29, Excel file "FY19 ACR FCM Q1-2-4-5 EOY.xlsx," tabs "Q2a," "Q2b," "Q2c," "Q2d," "Q2d\_air," "Q2d\_surface," "Q2e," "Q2f," and "Q2g."

**RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE  
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 3**

6. Please confirm that the Postal Service is unable to quantify the impact on FY 2019 service performance scores for First-Class Mail attributed to critically late trips (CLTs) or the air capacity gap.<sup>6</sup> If not confirmed, please provide quantification(s) and an explanation of the calculation(s).

**RESPONSE:**

Confirmed.

---

<sup>6</sup> See Docket No. ACR2018, Responses of the United States Postal Service to Questions 1-15, 17-50 of Chairman's Information Request No. 1, January 11, 2019, question 31-32 (Docket No. ACR2018 Responses to CHIR No. 1).

**RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE  
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 3**

7. Please refer to Library Reference USPS-FY19-29, Excel file "FY19 Marketing Mail Root Cause.xlsx," tab "Marketing – Root Causes."
- a. Please confirm that these data refer to the amount (number of percentage points) by which on-time performance decreased due to each specific root cause of failure.
  - b. If part a. of this question is not confirmed, please explain.
  - c. Please provide definitions and the hierarchy for assignment and assessment for the full set of root causes for USPS Marketing Mail, including each type of "Root Cause" appearing in tab "Marketing – Root Causes," column F.
  - d. Please identify which USPS Marketing Mail products are included in these data.
  - e. Please explain how these data were calculated.
  - f. Please confirm that a root cause failure indicator is not assigned to a mailpiece that is delivered within its applicable service standard. If not confirmed, please explain.
  - g. Please confirm that no more than one root cause failure indicator is assigned per mailpiece. If not confirmed, please explain.

**RESPONSE:**

- a. Confirmed.
- b. Not applicable.
- c. Root cause definitions and the hierarchy for assignment and assessment are included in the file "ChIR.3.RootCauseDefintnsHierarchy.xlsx" that is electronically attached to these responses.
- d. All USPS Marketing Mail Letter and Flat products are included with the exception of EDDM and Saturation Mail.
- e. These data were calculated by taking total failed volume attributed to each root casus divided by total failed volume attributed to all root causes multiplied by failure rate (((Failed Volume Attributed to Each Root Cause /

**RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE  
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 3**

Total Failed Volume Attributed to All Root Causes) \* (Total Failed Volume  
/ Total Volume)) \* 100).

f. Confirmed.

g. Confirmed.

**RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE  
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 3**

8. The Postal Service describes that headquarters instructs and trains local site management and craft personnel to process USPS Marketing Mail in First-In-First-Out (FIFO) order, run to daily processing capacity, comply with the Run Plan Generator (RPG), stage and scan mailpieces correctly, and use visualization and analytical tools.<sup>7</sup> Please provide a narrative response explaining how the Postal Service ensures that local sites adhere to this training and instruction. In the response, please provide examples of any best practices and/or lessons learned that drive compliance, if applicable.

**RESPONSE:**

The Postal Service uses the Mail Condition Visualization (MCV) tool, which provides near real-time visibility of a facility's on-hand volume, delayed processing volume, delayed dispatch volume, and oldest mail date by mail category and processing operation. This report shows if mail is being run in FIFO order. Each day, sites with high on-hand volume and/or delayed volume are reviewed. The top 20 are identified and notified, via email and daily telecons, to allow specific causes to be addressed.

Data from the cycle time tool are used to develop the Advance Day Zero Cycle Time Report. This report shows if sites are advancing Marketing Mail, and the amount of mail being advanced, which demonstrates they are running to capacity. We have determined that facilities that advance more than 40 percent of their Marketing Mail and/or have cycle times near 24 hours have consistently shown better service performance.

---

<sup>7</sup> Library Reference USPS-FY19-29, file "FY19-29 Service Performance Report.pdf," at 14.

**RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE  
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 3**

9. The Postal Service states that “[h]eadquarters has created heat maps to enable sites to see the patterns and correlations between their efforts and their scores.”<sup>8</sup> Please provide a narrative response explaining how the Postal Service ensures that local sites take action to correct or abate failures. In the response, please provide examples of any best practices and/or lessons learned that drive compliance, if applicable.

**RESPONSE:**

As sites are identified as having opportunity for improvement, communication between headquarters, areas, and districts are held via various methods, including email and teleconference. By following the processes and seeing the correlation between efforts and their scores, the engagement process kicks in – employees are inspired and empowered to continue their efforts for following processes and delivering positive business results.

---

<sup>8</sup> Library Reference USPS-FY19-29, file “FY19-29 Service Performance Report.pdf,” at 15.

**RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE  
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 3**

- 10.** For each End-to-End USPS Marketing Mail product with a 6-10-day service standard, please provide the volume and the percentage based on the total USPS Marketing Mail volume that is End-to-End and has a 6-10-day service standard for FY 2019.<sup>9</sup>

**RESPONSE:**

USPS Marketing Mail Product	Measured Volume
High Density/Saturation Letters	53,146,271
High Density/Saturation Flats/Parcels	6,024,452
Carrier Route	28,756,568
Letters	2,840,594,884
Flats	432,655,009
Parcels	3,382,015
EDDM-Retail	0

USPS Marketing Mail Product	Percent of Total Measured Volume of the Product	Percent of Total Measured Marketing Mail
High Density/Saturation Letters	1.00%	0.10%
High Density/Saturation Flats/Parcels	0.14%	0.01%
Carrier Route	0.64%	0.06%
Letters	8.36%	5.56%
Flats	17.56%	0.85%
Parcels	17.31%	0.01%
EDDM-Retail	0.00%	0.00%

---

<sup>9</sup> See Docket No. ACR2018 Responses to CHIR No. 1, question 36.



**RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE  
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 3**

- 11.** Please confirm that the Postal Service is unable to quantify the impact on FY 2019 service performance scores for Periodicals.<sup>10</sup> If not confirmed, please provide such quantification and explain how it was calculated.

**RESPONSE:**

Confirmed; data are not readily available.

---

<sup>10</sup> See Docket No. ACR2018 Responses to CHIR No. 1, question 37.

**RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE  
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 3**

- 12.** Please explain what methods, metrics, and processes the Postal Service utilized to determine the top root causes for Periodicals products not meeting service targets in FY 2019.

**RESPONSE:**

Please refer to the Postal Service's response to Question 11 of Chairman's Information Request No. 3.

**RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE  
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 3**

- 13.** The Postal Service describes that it continues to work to ensure that local sites process Periodicals in FIFO order, run to daily processing capacity, comply with the Run Plan Generator (RPG), use visualization and analytical tools such as the Grid, and minimize Work in Process (WIP) cycle time.<sup>11</sup> Please provide a narrative response explaining how the Postal Service ensures that local sites adhere to these operational requirements. In the response, please provide examples of any best practices and/or lessons learned that drive compliance, if applicable.

**RESPONSE:**

The Postal Service uses the Mail Condition Visualization (MCV) tool, which provides near real-time visibility of a facility's on-hand volume, delayed processing volume, delayed dispatch volume, and oldest mail date by mail category and processing operation. This report shows if mail is being run in FIFO order. Each day, sites with high on-hand volume and/or delayed volume are reviewed. The top 20 are identified and notified via email and daily telecons, to allow specific causes to be addressed.

Data from the cycle time tool are used to ensure sites are processing mail in a timely manner. A report similar to one used for Marketing Mail is in development, with completion planned by quarter 4, FY 2020.

---

<sup>11</sup> Library Reference USPS-FY19-29, file "FY19-29 Service Performance Report.pdf," at 18.

**RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE  
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 3**

- 14.** Please confirm that the Postal Service is unable to quantify the impact on FY 2019 service performance scores for Bound Printed Matter (BPM) Flats and Media Mail/Library Mail.<sup>12</sup> If not confirmed, please provide such quantification and explain how it was calculated.

**RESPONSE:**

Confirmed.

---

<sup>12</sup> See Docket No. ACR2018 Responses to CHIR No. 1, question 40.

**RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE  
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 3**

- 15.** Please explain what methods, metrics, and processes the Postal Service utilized to determine the top root causes for BPM Flats and Media Mail/Library Mail not meeting service targets in FY 2019.

**RESPONSE:**

Please refer to the Postal Service's response to Question 14 of Chairman's Information Request No. 3.

**RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE  
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 3**

- 16.** Please provide the volume and percentage of BPM Flats and Media Mail/Library Mail that were manually processed in FY 2019.<sup>13</sup>

**RESPONSE:**

The Postal Service does not track the Bound Printed Matter flats and Media Mail/Library Mail volumes that are processed in manual operations. As stated in previous ACR dockets, the volume of flat-shaped mail pieces that weigh over 20 ounces are considered to be nonautomation mail pieces according to DMM Section 201.6.2.2. The volume of flats weighing over 20 ounces can therefore be used as an approximation for the amount of flat-shaped mail that is processed manually for the Package Services mail class.

The FY 2019 Bound Printed Matter flats data corresponding to the material provided last year on January 11, 2019 in response to ChIR No. 1, Question 42 (as cited in the footnote below from the question) can be found in USPS-FY19-45, file 'FY19.Rule.3050.50.Para.B.xlsx', tab 'Item b7-b', cells B40:I46. These data are also shown below:

	Volume		Proportion	
	Under 20 oz	Over 20 oz	Under 20 oz	Over 20 oz
Non DDU SP/Presort BPM Flats	44,274,047	64,731,025	40.6%	59.4%
DDU SP/Presort BPM Flats	21,760	28,549	43.3%	56.7%
Carrier Route BPM Flats	23,683,516	121,628,905	16.3%	83.7%
	67,979,323	186,388,479	26.72%	73.28%

---

<sup>13</sup> See Docket No. ACR2018 Responses to CHIR No. 1, question 42.

**RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE  
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 3**

Media Mail/Library Mail flats data are not included in USPS-FY19-45 because this product does not meet the 80-percent flats threshold specified in Order No. 5086 (May 8, 2019). Flat-shaped mail pieces represent only 8.99 percent of Media Mail/Library Mail, and 11.81 percent of these mail pieces weigh over 20 ounces.

Machinable Media Mail/Library Mail parcels are processed in mechanized operations that are performed on parcel sorting equipment. Mail pieces that are rejected by this equipment are processed in manual non-incoming secondary operations. In addition, non-machinable mail pieces are also processed in manual non-incoming secondary operations. All parcel-shaped mail pieces, regardless of the specific product, are sorted to the carrier route level in manual incoming secondary operations, unless the destinating facility is one of a handful of postal facilities that contain the automated delivery unit sorter (ADUS).

**RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE  
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 3**

17. As part of its plan to improve service performance, the Postal Service states that it “continues to review the entry and make-up requirements for BPM Flats and Media Mail.”<sup>14</sup>
- a. Please describe any changes to the entry and make-up requirements that were implemented in FY 2019.
  - b. For any changes to the entry and make-up requirements to address service performance that are planned or pending review, please describe the planned change, identify the problem that the change is expected to remediate, and provide an estimated timeframe for implementation.

**RESPONSE:**

- a. There were no changes made in FY 2019 to the entry and make-up requirements for BPM flats or Media Mail. No changes are planned or are pending review.
- b. N/A.

---

<sup>14</sup> Library Reference USPS-FY19-29, file “FY19-29 Service Performance Report.pdf,” at 25.



**RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE  
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 3**

- 18.** As part of its mitigation plan for BPM Flats service performance for FY 2020, the Postal Service states that it will focus on “reduc[ing] the actual entry time (AET) of mailing to first automation scan, thereby reducing the WIP cycle time for machine compatible pieces.”<sup>15</sup> Please explain how the Postal Service intends to measure local sites’ achievement of this operational goal.

**RESPONSE:**

As stated in the response to Question 13 of this Information Request, the cycle time tool is used to ensure sites are processing mail in a timely manner. A report similar to one used for Marketing Mail is in development, with completion planned by quarter 4, FY 2020.

---

<sup>15</sup> Library Reference USPS-FY19-29, file “FY19-29 Service Performance Report.pdf,” at 25.

**RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE  
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 3**

19. Please quantify the volume and percentage of BPM Flats that were advanced to day zero in FY 2019.<sup>16</sup>

**RESPONSE:**

Processed on Day Zero?	% of Measured Volume	Measured Volume
Yes	12.97%	4,770,419
No	87.03%	32,009,288

---

<sup>16</sup> See Docket No. ACR2018 Responses to CHIR No. 1, question 44.

**RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE  
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 3**

- 20.** For each of the following statements, please provide all data used for comparison—including supporting reasons and analysis. If the basis for any of the statements is quantitative, please include a description of the methodology used to develop this comparison.<sup>17</sup> If the basis for any of the statements is qualitative, please provide a narrative justification for the comparison.
- a. For USPS Marketing Mail service performance, “five of the nine products improved in FY 2019 compared to FY 2018.”<sup>18</sup>
  - b. For Periodicals service performance, “there was improvement between FY 2018 and FY 2019.”<sup>19</sup>

**RESPONSE:**

The statements were based on the FY 2019 data reported in USPS-FY19-29, file “FY19-29 Service Performance Report.pdf,” at 11, 16, compared with the FY 2018 data reported in USPS-FY18-29, file “FY18-29 Service Performance Report.pdf,” at 11, 14.

- a. Chart below is for Marketing Mail.

USPS Marketing Mail®	Origin / Desination			
	Target	2019 % On-Time	2018 % On-Time	Difference
High Density and Saturation Letters	91.8	93.1	93.0	0.1
High Density and Saturation Flats/Parcels	91.8	89.4	88.3	1.1
Carrier Route	91.8	90.0	89.5	0.5
Letters	91.8	89.2	89.4	-0.2
Flats	91.8	77.6	76.5	1.1
EDDM-Retail	91.8	75.7	74.4	1.3
Parcels	91.8	97.9	98.0	-0.1
Mixed Product Standard Letters	91.8	75.4	76.7	-1.3
Mixed Product Standard Flats	91.8	50.7	51.0	-0.3

- b. Chart below is for Periodicals

---

<sup>17</sup> See Docket No. PI2015-1, Order Approving Use of Internal Measurement Systems, July 5, 2018, at 63 (Order No. 4697).

<sup>18</sup> Library Reference USPS-FY19-29, file “FY19-29 Service Performance Report.pdf,” at 14.

<sup>19</sup> Library Reference USPS-FY19-29, file “FY19-29 Service Performance Report.pdf,” at 18.

**RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE  
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 3**

Product Type	FY2019 Percent On Time	FY2018 Percent On Time	Change
Periodicals - Within County	85.7	85.6	0.1
Periodicals - Outside County	85.4	85.3	0.1

**RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE  
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 3**

- 21.** Please provide the percent of Market Dominant mail measured by Full-Service Intelligent Mail Barcode (IMb) in FY 2019 disaggregated by mail class (e.g., First-Class Mail, USPS Marketing Mail, Periodicals, and Package Services).<sup>20</sup> Please present results disaggregated by fiscal quarter and the total for the fiscal year.

**RESPONSE:**

Mail Class	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4	Fiscal Year
Presort First-Class Mail	69.01%	73.10%	76.80%	76.23%	73.71%
USPS Marketing Mail	74.57%	80.06%	83.87%	77.16%	78.63%
Periodicals	72.62%	70.87%	71.35%	68.61%	70.92%
Package Services	47.75%	57.62%	51.52%	46.74%	49.37%

---

<sup>20</sup> See Docket No. ACR2018 Responses to CHIR No. 1, question 49.

**RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE  
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 3**

**22.** Please provide the information requested in the following table for FY 2019.<sup>21</sup>

<b>Product</b>	<b>Percentage of Mail in Measurement</b>	<b>Percentage of Mail entered at Full-Service IMb prices and included in measurement</b>	<b>Percentage of Mail Processed as Full-Service IMb, but excluded from measurement</b>
<b>First-Class Mail</b>			
Presorted Letters/Postcards			
Flats			
<b>USPS Marketing Mail</b>			
High Density and Saturation Letters			
High Density and Saturation Flats/Parcels			
Carrier Route			
Letters			
Flats			
EDDM-Retail			
Parcels			
Total USPS Marketing Mail			
<b>Periodicals</b>			
In-County			
Outside County			
<b>Package Services</b>			
Bound Printed Matter Flats			
N/A = Not Applicable			
Not Available = The Postal Service does not have this information available.			

---

<sup>21</sup> See Docket No. ACR2018 Responses to CHIR No. 1, question 50.

**RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE  
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 3**

**RESPONSE:**

<b>Product</b>	<b>Percentage of Mail in Measurement</b>	<b>Percentage of Mail entered at Full-Service IMb prices and included in measurement</b>	<b>Percentage of Mail Processed as Full-Service IMb, but excluded from measurement</b>
<b>First-Class Mail</b>			
Presorted Letters/Postcards	67.83%	73.75%	26.25%
Flats	58.14%	70.51%	29.49%
<b>USPS Marketing Mail</b>			
High Density and Saturation Letters	73.35%	77.99%	22.01%
High Density and Saturation Flats/Parcels	37.42%	65.64%	34.36%
Carrier Route	71.19%	74.70%	25.30%
Letters	73.90%	80.12%	19.88%
Flats	64.55%	75.52%	24.48%
EDDM-Retail	62.78%	N/A	N/A
Parcels	53.01%	Not Available	Not Available
Total USPS Marketing Mail	67.44%	78.63%	21.37%
<b>Periodicals</b>			
In-County	11.00%	Not Available	Not Available
Outside County	59.68%	Not Available	Not Available
<b>Package Services</b>			
Bound Printed Matter Flats	13.59%	49.37%	50.63%
N/A = Not Applicable			
Not Available = The Postal Service does not have this information available.			